

GOAL 1: Improve Student Achievement, With a Focus on Bringing All Students to Grade Level in Reading and Mathematics by 2014

Measures for Objective 1.1: Percentage of students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.1.A. All Students	*	68.3	72.3	70.2	76.2	70.5	80.2	Sept. 2010	84.2	88.1
1.1.B. Low-Income Students	*	55.3	60.9	57.4	66.5	58.1	72.1	Sept. 2010	77.7	83.2
1.1.F. Students With Disabilities	*	38.7	51.8	41.5	54.0	42.2	61.7	Sept. 2010	69.4	77.0
1.1.G. Limited English Proficient Students	*	39.8	47.3	38.8	54.9	39.8	62.4	Sept. 2010	69.9	77.4
1.1.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators***					61	68	64	May 2010	68	68
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups**:										
1.1.C. American Indian/Alaska Native	*	60.1	65.1	62.4	70.1	62.2	75.1	Sept. 2010	80.1	85.0
1.1.D. African American	*	55.5	61.1	58.4	66.6	57.7	72.2	Sept. 2010	77.8	83.3
1.1.E. Hispanic	*	52.0	58.0	54.3	64.0	56.3	70.0	Sept. 2010	76.0	82.0

* New measure in 2007. 2006 actual data are reported as baseline for 2007 and 2008 targets.

** African American, American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic students when they are of a statistically significant number to be reported by the states.

*** This measure was a newly established performance measure under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV). Formerly there was one measure for academic achievement under Perkins III that included a measure that combined student results on reading and mathematics assessments.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.1, the targets were not met but results improved for FY 2008. Measures 1.1.C and 1.1.D declined slightly. There was no effect on program performance. Targets adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting since the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies (SEAs) to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to integrate state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery. Data for school year 2009–2010 are expected in September 2010.

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state reading assessments by 2014. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a linear fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 as updates to the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Measures for Objective 1.2: Percentage of students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.2.A. All Students	*	65.0	69.4	68.0	73.8	69.6	78.1	Sept. 2010	82.5	86.9
1.2.B. Low-Income Students	*	52.3	58.3	55.9	64.2	57.8	70.2	Sept. 2010	76.2	82.1
1.2.F. Students With Disabilities	*	37.8	52.2	41.9	53.3	42.5	61.1	Sept. 2010	68.9	76.7
1.2.G. Limited English Proficient Students	*	43.3	50.4	44.7	57.5	46.7	64.6	Sept. 2010	71.7	78.7
1.2.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators***					54	62	57	May 2010	62	63
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups**:										
1.2.C. American Indian/Alaska Native	*	53.2	59.1	56.8	64.9	58.6	70.8	Sept. 2010	76.6	82.5
1.2.D. African American	*	48.8	55.2	52.9	61.6	54.1	68.0	Sept. 2010	74.4	80.8
1.2.E. Hispanic	*	51.8	57.8	54.8	63.9	57.7	69.9	Sept. 2010	75.9	81.9

* New measure in 2007. 2006 actual data are reported as baseline for 2007 and 2008 targets.

** African American, American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic students when they are of a statistically significant number to be reported by the states.

*** This measure was a newly established performance measure under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV). Formerly there was one measure for academic achievement under Perkins III that included a measure that combined student results on reading and mathematics assessments.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.2, the targets were not met but results improved over prior years for FY 2008. There was no effect on overall program or activity performance. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to encourage the integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery. Measures were not in place for 2006; data for school year 2009–2010 are expected in September 2010.

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments by 2014. The baselines are the actual results in 2006. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by: (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a straight-line fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target.

Measures for Objective 1.3: Percentage of class type taught by highly qualified teachers

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.3.A. Total Core Academic Classes	*	91	100	94	100	95	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.B. Total Core Elementary Classes**	95	94	100	95.9	100	96.5	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.C. Core Elementary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	*	90.4	100	93.5	100	94.9	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.D. Core Elementary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	*	95.8	100	96.6	100	97.5	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.E. Total Core Secondary Classes**	92	90.9	100	93	100	93.9	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.F. Core Secondary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	*	85.7	100	88.7	100	89.6	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.G. Core Secondary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	*	93.8	100	95.4	100	96	100	Mar 2010	100	100

* New measure in 2007.

** FY 2006 targets based on earlier measures.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.3, targets were not met but results improved over prior years. There was no effect on overall program or activity performance. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to encourage the integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The targets are based on legislative initiatives, including the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended.

Measures for Objective 1.4: Promoting safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments

Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who:	Results*								Plan	
	FY 2003		FY 2005		FY 2007		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.4.A. Carried a Weapon (Such as a Knife, Gun, or Club) on School Property One or More Times During the Past 30 Days	N/A	6.1	5.0	6.5	5.0	5.9	4.0	August 2010	N/A*	4.0
1.4.B. Missed One or More Days of School During the Past 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School, or on Their Way to and from School	N/A	5.4	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	August 2010	N/A*	4.0
1.4.C. Were Offered, Given, or Sold an Illegal Drug by Someone on School Property in the Past Year	N/A	28.7	28.0	25.4	27.0	22.3	26.0	August 2010	N/A*	25.0

N/A = Not Available.

*Data gathered only in odd-numbered years.

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Analysis of Progress: For FY 2007, targets were not met but results generally improved over prior years for measures 1.4.A. and 1.4.B. The results for measure 1.4.C. exceeded the target. Desired results are declines in reported activities.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, a data collection supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The survey monitors six categories of priority health risk behaviors among youth, including violence and alcohol and other drug use. Data reported for these measures come from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System National Survey; data for this survey are collected in odd years and reported in the following even year. Details about the methods used to select the sample and other issues are available at <http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/index.htm>. Data from the FY 2009 survey will be available in summer 2010.

Target Context: Lower percentages indicate improvement on these measures. Data are based on a biennial survey and gathered only in odd-numbered years.

Measures for Objective 1.5: Increasing information and options for parents

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.5.A. Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice	N/A	1.2	N/A	2.2	2.4	2.3	N/A	Jan. 2010	3.6	N/A
1.5.B. Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services	N/A	14	15.4	14.5	16.8	13.8	18.2	Jan. 2010	19.6	20.3
1.5.C. Number of Charter Schools in Operation	3,600	3,997	3,900	4,155	4,290	4,376	4,720	Feb. 2010	5,190	5,710

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Measure 1.5.A.: Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice

Analysis of Progress: Target not fully met in FY 2008 but improved over prior years. No target set for FY 2009. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The 2006 actual serves as the baseline. Targets for this measure were developed for every two years from the baseline year (2006). Accordingly, there is no target for 2007, 2009, or 2011. The target for 2008 is the baseline times two (2006 actual x 2). The target for 2010 is the baseline times 3 (2006 actual x 3).

Measure 1.5.B.: Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services

Analysis of Progress: Target not met in FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The 2006 actual serves as the baseline. The target for 2007 is the baseline times 1.1 (1.1 x 2006 actual). The target for 2008 is the baseline times 1.2 (1.2 x 2006 actual). The target for 2009 is the baseline times 1.3 (2006 actual x 1.3). The target for 2010 is the baseline times 1.4 (2006 actual x 1.4). The target for 2011 is the baseline times 1.45 (2006 actual x 1.45).

Measure 1.5.C.: Number of Charter Schools in Operation

Analysis of Progress: Target exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: FY 2007 and FY 2008. Source: U.S. Department of Education, Education Data Exchange Network (EDFacts). Prior years' data were reported by the Center for Education Reform. The performance goal for the Charter Schools program is to increase the number of charter schools in operation by 10 percent each year beginning in 2005.

Measures for Objective 1.6: Percentage of 18–24-Year-Olds Who Have Completed High School¹

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.6.A. Total	87.6	87.8	87.3	89.0	87.4	July 2010	87.6	July 2011	87.8	88.0
1.6.B. African American	83.4	84.8	85.3	88.8	85.5	July 2010	85.8	July 2011	86.0	86.3
1.6.C. Hispanic	70.2	70.8*	70.1	72.7	70.3	July 2010	70.6	July 2011	71.0	71.5
1.6.D. Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate²	74.3	73.2*	75.2	73.9	76.6	July 2010	77.9	July 2011	79.3	80.8

Sources:

*Adjusted totals

¹U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey. Data are collected annually.

²U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, State Non-fiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education. Data are collected annually. Averaged freshman graduation rate is a Common Core of Data measure that provides an estimate of the percentage of high school students who graduate on time by dividing the number of graduates with regular diplomas by the size of the incoming class four years earlier.

Measures 1.6.A., 1.6.B. and 1.6.C.: Total, African American and Hispanic

Analysis of Progress: Most targets were exceeded in FY 2006 and FY 2007. Data for FY 2008 and FY 2009 are not yet available and thus unable to be assessed. Targets have been adjusted to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for column “FY 2006” in the table were based on data for the 2005–2006 school year, released in September 2008. Data for the 2006–2007 school year (column “FY 2007” in the table) were released in September 2009. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column “FY 2008”) are not expected for release until July 2010. Data for the 2008–2009 school year (column “FY 2009”) are not expected for release until July 2011.

Measure 1.6.D.: Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2008 and FY 2009 are not yet available and are unable to be assessed. Targets were not met for FY 2006 or FY 2007, but improvement is shown.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012*, published in May 2007, included measures developed in 2006. The 2005–2006 (column “FY 2006” in this table) data were released in July 2008. Data for the 2006–2007 school year (column “FY 2007”) were released in September 2009. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column “FY 2008”) are not expected for release until July 2010. Data for the 2008–2009 school year (column “FY 2009”) are not expected for release until July 2011.

Target Context: As of July 2009, 20 states reported adjusted cohort graduation rates. The rates track students from when they enter high school to when they leave. Other states used measures based on annually reported aggregate data that did not follow the progress of individual students over time. Twenty-eight states estimated graduation rates by dividing the number of graduates in a given year by the number of graduates plus estimates of dropouts over the preceding 4 years. This rate has been referred to as the leaver rate. The remaining states used other measures to fulfill this reporting requirement. Because of the lack of comparability in the different approaches taken to reporting on-time graduation rates and because of limitations in the leaver rate for measuring on-time graduation, the Department publishes a rate designed to estimate on-time graduation for all states using a common data source: the Common Core of Data, produced by the National Center for Education Statistics. That rate, technically referred to as the averaged freshman graduation rate, uses aggregate data to estimate the number of first-time 9th graders in the fall 4 years prior to the graduation year being reported and divides that into the number of diplomas awarded in the reporting year.

Measures for Objective 1.7: Transforming education into an evidence-based field

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Number of Department-Supported Programs and Practices with Evidence of Efficacy Using WWC Standards:										
1.7.A. Reading or Writing	3	3	6	6	11	11	13	13	15	17
1.7.B. Mathematics or Science	1	1	3	4	7	8	10	11	12	15
1.7.C. Teacher Quality	1	1	3	3	5	5	7	7	10	12
1.7.D. Number of Visits to the WWC** Website			*	482,000	530,000	531,162	583,000	772,154	641,000	705,000

* New measure in 2007. The 2007 actual serves as the baseline.

**WWC = What Works Clearinghouse.

Measures 1.7.A., 1.7.B. and 1.7.C.: Reading or Writing, Mathematics or Science and Teacher Quality

Analysis of Progress: In fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009, targets for reading, writing and teacher quality were met and targets for mathematics or science were exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data were self-reported by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

Target Context: The Department's measures for evaluating progress toward the goal of transforming education into an evidence-based field are tied to the clearinghouse. The measures assess the productivity of IES's investments in producing scientifically valid research on teaching and instruction with respect to the core academic competencies of reading/writing and mathematics/science. The measure that is tracked is the number of programs and practices on these topics that have been developed with IES funding and that have been shown to be effective in raising student achievement under the research quality standards of the clearinghouse. As shown by clearinghouse reviews of existing research on program effectiveness in reading/writing and mathematics, few older studies meet the clearinghouse quality standards. Thus the targets under this measure are ambitious and will, if met, result in a doubling—or more—of the existing base of research-proven programs and practices. Targets are based on the number of grants awarded in the subject areas and the maturation of the grants and the numbers are cumulative.

Measure 1.7.D.: Number of Visits to the WWC Web site

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2007 target of setting a baseline was met. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets were exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data were self-reported by IES.

Target Context: This is a measure of utilization. It addresses the degree to which work that the clearinghouse has identified as effective is being accessed. The clearinghouse Web site is already heavily visited. The targets were set in 2007 using FY 2006 actual data as a baseline.